

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

In re Polyurethane Foam Antitrust  
Litigation

Case No. 1:10 MD 2196

This document relates to: ALL CASES

ORDER RE: PRODUCTION OF  
URETHANE EXPERT REPORTS

JUDGE JACK ZOUHARY

Direct Action Plaintiffs, along with the Direct and Indirect Purchaser Classes (collectively “Plaintiffs”), seek discovery of expert reports, prepared on behalf of certain Defendants in their capacity as direct action plaintiffs in related litigation. The parties submitted statements in support of and in opposition to the production of these reports (attached Exhibits A–C). At this Court’s direction, Defendants submitted the expert reports for *in camera* review. In total, Defendants submitted six documents from two experts, including revised reports: Matthew Raiff’s (“Raiff”) April 2011 Report; Raiff’s May 2011 Revised Report (along with a separate file reflecting only the Report revisions); Raiff’s May 2012 Reply Report; Raiff’s July 2012 Revised Reply Report; and Leslie Marx’s September 2013 Rule 26 Disclosure.

After *in camera* review of each document, this Court concludes the documents are relevant to this litigation and should be produced, consistent, of course, with the terms of the protective order entered by the Kansas federal district court. This Order does not signal admissibility at trial or for other merits briefing; that issue is for another day. However, at this juncture, the reports satisfy the discovery standard of Civil Rule 26(b). The respective Defendants will produce each report to

Plaintiffs by **Friday, April 25, 2014**, along with the related backup data and expert deposition testimony, as requested by Plaintiffs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jack Zouhary  
JACK ZOUHARY  
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE

April 23, 2014